

REMARKS

In the outstanding Official Action, the disclosure was objected to because of the noted informality on page 4, and appropriate correction was required. In response, the noted informality has been corrected as suggested in the Action, and it is respectfully submitted that the specification is now in proper form.

On the merits, claim 6 was deemed to be allowable, while claims 1-4, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kianush et al. in view of Davie et al. and further in view of Haartsen, with claim 7-10 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the foregoing references and further in view of Bijker et al., all for the reasons of record.

In response, independent claims 1 and 2 have been amended in order to more clearly and precisely define the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 2, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

Claims 1 and 2, as herein amended, now clearly recite that the receiver comprises a soft limiting amplifier located upstream of the demodulator (prior to demodulation) such that the entire soft

limiting amplifying operation occurs prior to the demodulation function. In Kianush, on the contrary, a substantially different circuit configuration from the circuit presently claimed is shown and described. More particularly, the soft limiting amplifier (AL) has an input coupled to the receiver circuit downstream of the demodulator (DEM), such that the amplifier is clearly coupled to the circuit subsequent to demodulation, rather than prior to demodulation as now claimed in claims 1 and 2. Clearly, the circuit in Kianush is a feedback circuit in which an output is taken after the demodulator circuit, then fed to a soft limiting amplifier, with the output of the soft limiting amplifier being back to the IF filters (IF2). In the instant circuit as now claimed in amended claims 1 and 2, a substantially different configuration is employed in which the soft limiting amplifiers are coupled in a feed-forward circuit located upstream of the demodulator.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the foregoing deficiencies in the primary reference are not overcome by the cited and applied secondary references, so that the currently-pending independent claims, as herein amended, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims are clearly

patentable as depending from and further limiting the subject matter of claim 1 or 2.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Steven R. Biren, Reg. No. 26,531
Attorney
(914) 333-9630

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

On 8/16/04

By 
Steven R. Biren, Reg. No. 26,531